

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to an IDS dated March 26, 2006, for failing to supply an English translation, or statement of relevance for DE 10133945. The correct date of IDS in question was March 10, 2006, not March 26, 2006.

Applicant is submitting herewith an Information Disclosure Statement, with an English Abstract of the non-English language document DE 10133945, obviating the basis for the objection to the March 10, 2006 Information Disclosure Statement.

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 11, 14, 32, and 24 under U.S. patent publication 2003/0011509 to Honda in view of U.S. patent publication 2003/0201929 to Lutter.

As recited, e.g., in the claims, when it is determined that an identical object has been detected by a radar detection unit and an image detection unit in a previous collation, i.e., when a previous fusion object has been detected in the previous collation, the collating unit, in the present collation, performs a first collation between an object detected by the radar detection unit in the present collation, and the previous fusion object; performs a second collation between an object detected by the image detection unit in the present detection collation and the previous fusion object; and determines whether the radar detection unit and the image detection unit detect the same object in the present collation, based on the first and second collations.

In contrast, Honda discloses determining whether a target detected by a camera, and a target detected by a radar, are identical based on different collations. Honda discloses collating an object detected by the radar and an object detected by the camera in a present detection, and determining whether the detected objects are identical. Honda does not disclose performing first and second collations between an

object detected in the present detection and a fusion object from a previous collation, and determining if the object detected by radar and a camera is the same object based on the present collation..

Lutter does not disclose the features missing from of Honda. Lutter discloses an object, detected by a multi-sensor (A), moving to a zone mounted by a different multi-sensor B. Multi-sensor system A sends information regarding the object, and the object is detected by multi-sensor system B.

Consequently, neither Honda nor Lutter, alone or in combination, disclose all of the features of the claims, and the combination of these references fails to create a *prima facie* case of obviousness.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 11-30.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 31, 2008

By: 
James W. Edmondson
Reg. No. 33,871

Attachments: Information Disclosure Statement, Information Disclosure Citation, and one (1) document.